

MORI BUNDLE # _____

DATE _____

PAGES _____

Box _____

Folder # _____

Fon # _____

BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

FOIAb3b

CPYRGHT

The Cuban Invasion—II

Rebels' Defeat Is Ascribed to Errors In Plan and Execution in Washington

CPYRGHT

by HANSON W. BALDWIN

This is the second of two articles on the unsuccessful attempt by anti-Castro forces to invade Cuba last April.

THE invasion of Cuba last April, it is now clear, was lost in Washington.

The small invading force was adjudged shortly before the operation, in a written report submitted by a Colonel Hawking of the Marine Corps, to be "battleworthy" and comparatively almost as well equipped as a similar United States unit. This judgment had some effect in Washington and, observers contend, was borne out by the actual fighting.

Despite the casualty statistics (some 1,200 of the 1,500 to 1,600 captured), the invaders gave a good account of themselves. Most sources agree that the refugees fought well until their ammunition ran out, that they inflicted more casualties on Fidel Castro's forces than he had conceded, and that the Cuban militia in the area of the landing almost immediately defected in scores to the invaders' side only to defect back again to Dr. Castro after the failure of the invasion became obvious.

Like the British and French invasion of Port Said during the Suez crisis of 1956, the Cuban operational plans and their implementation were based on a faulty premise: that the United States would not intervene.

McGeorge Bundy, a Presidential assistant, shrewd and manfully has accepted blame for insufficiently emphasizing to the President the dangerousness of the venture.

It is apparent that attention to failure, and all the psychological and political disadvantages associated with the term "Yankee imperialism." And our backing of the Cuban refugees was so thinly disguised that it immediately exposed Washington to the same charges we would have faced had United States armed forces been employed.

The second great lesson of Cuba is the importance of tight policy control, direction and management of any venture involving the application of military power, no matter how small.

This control and management must center in the President as Commander in Chief, each President will use the machinery of government differently, but history has shown that ordered discussions and debates and staff work, and recorded decisions may bring new insight and prevent major mistakes. These procedures were largely lacking in the Kennedy Administration prior to the time of the Cuban invasion.

Lessons of the C.I.A.

A third lesson of Cuba is that no military or paramilitary operation should be under the control of the Central Intelligence Agency. It is of such a nature and character that it is bound to become overt or open rather than covert or secret. Operations of the size of the Cuban invasion should be managed by the Defense Department which is far better staffed and has more expert military knowledge than the C.I.A.

Another lesson is the necessity of keeping all secret intelligence activities and operations under constant top-secret surveillance and review. Machinery

and procedures which have been used too often made mistakes, but the principles they embody, differing military approaches to the same military problem, the right of dissent, collective wisdom as opposed to the judgments of a single military mind, are essential in the future, as there have been in the past.

In sum, the failure of Cuba was a failure of bureaucracy, but as in all failures it was primarily a failure of men rather than of organization.

From Admiral W. E. Eccles, former commander-in-chief of the U.S. Fleet, in his comments in "Notes on Cuban Crisis," a paper presented before the Washington University Intelligence Research Project.

Admiral Eccles, in his paper, states that the sponsorship of the Central Intelligence Agency by the President, and the lack of other, more complete, and more effective civilian control of national policy and its execution, contributed to the task of the invaders. He adds that "in great measure, the President and his advisers failed to live up to three basic analyses of the situation: (1) the need for strict military unity; (2) the price of failure; and (3) the more effective execution of military policy."

Admiral Eccles stresses that certain ventures might succeed in "the present political map" but failure of the venture would be understood to be due to the lack of political power rather than by technical failure.

SOURCE: CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

100-40008-1